

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY



3 1761 10631508 8

Cases and Materials on Remedies

prepared by  
Robert J. Sharpe

1980-81



Cases and Materials on Remedies

prepared by  
Robert J. Sharpe

1980-81

Toronto  
Faculty of Law  
University of Toronto  
1980

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from  
University of Toronto

## REMEDIES

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. <u>Injunctions</u>	1
<u>Judicature Act</u>	1
(a) <u>Interlocutory Injunctions</u>	2
(i) <u>Types of Interlocutory orders:</u> <u>Century Engineering Co. v. Greto</u> <u>et al.,</u>	3
(ii) <u>Principles Governing the Granting</u> <u>of Interlocutory Injunctions:</u> <u>Terra Communications Ltd. et al.</u> <u>v. Communicomp Data Ltd. et al.</u>	3
<u>Note: Appeals from Interlocutory</u> <u>Injunctions</u>	12
(iii) <u>The Requirement for a "Prima Facie"</u> <u>Case:</u> <u>American Cynamid Co. v. Ethicon</u> <u>Ltd.,</u>	15
<u>Toronto Marlboros v. Tonelli</u>	21
<u>Yule v. Atlantic Pizza Delight</u> <u>Franchise (1968) Ltd. et al.</u>	22
<u>Fellowes &amp; Son v. Fisher,</u>	29
<u>Cantol v. Brodi Chemicals</u>	29
<u>Hubbard and Others v. Pitt and</u> <u>Others</u>	38
<u>Bruce, "The New Injunction Game"</u>	48
(iv) <u>Interlocutory Injunctions in</u> <u>Labour Disputes</u>	50
<u>Texpack Ltd. v. Rowley</u>	53
<u>Ford Motor Co. of Canada Ltd. v.</u> <u>McDermott</u>	56
<u>Alex Henry &amp; Sons Ltd. v. Gale</u> <u>et al.,</u>	60
<u>Re Canteen of Canada and</u> <u>Retail Union</u>	63
(v) <u>Irreparable Harm:</u>	67
<u>The Attorney-General v. Hallett</u>	68
(vi) <u>Undertaking as to Damages:</u> <u>Vieweger Construction Co. Ltd. v.</u> <u>Rush &amp; Tompkins Construction Ltd.,</u>	69



	<u>W.M. Halliday Contracting Co. Ltd. v. Nicols et al.,</u>	71
	<u>Upper Canada College v. City of Toronto</u>	73
	<u>F. Hoffman - La Roche &amp; Co. A.G. v. Secretary of State for Trade and Industry</u>	75
(vii)	<u>Preservation of Status Quo: Dodd v. Amalgamated Marine Workers' Union</u>	76
	<u>Woodford v. Smith</u>	77
	<u>The Law Society of Upper Canada v. MacNaughton et al.</u>	78
(viii)	Interlocutory Injunctions in Defama- tion Actions	
	Blackstone <u>Commentaries</u> Book IV,	80
	<u>Bonnard v. Perryman,</u>	81
	<u>Canada Metal Co. Ltd. et al. v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp. et al.,</u>	84
	<u>Canada Metal Co. Ltd. et al. v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp. et al.,</u>	90
	<u>Canada Metal Co. Ltd. et al. v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp. et al.,</u>	92
	<u>Canada Metal Co. Ltd. et al. v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp. et al.,</u>	93
	<u>A.G. v. Times Newspapers</u>	94
	Miller, <u>Contempt of Court</u>	97
	<u>Bridges v. California</u>	104
	<u>Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart</u>	109
(ix)	<u>Interlocutory Injunctions to Restrain Disposition of Assets Pending Trial</u>	113
(x)	<u>The "Anton Piller" Injunction:</u>	126
(xi)	<u>Injunctions to Restrain the Com- mission of a Crime</u>	131

<u>Attorney-General for Ontario v. Grabarchuk et al.</u>	131
<u>Attorney-General for Ontario v. Grabarchuk et al.</u>	133
<u>Re Regina and Odeon Morton Theatres Ltd.</u>	136
<u>Kent District v. Storgoff et al.</u>	137
<u>Gouriet v. U.P.W.</u>	141
<u>Re Regina and Shaben</u>	155
Note re Standing	157
(b) <u>Permanent Injunctions</u>	
(i) <u>Quia Timet</u>	
<u>Fletcher v. Bealey</u>	164
<u>Hooper v. Rogers</u>	169
(ii) <u>Mandatory Injunctions</u>	
<u>Redland Bricks Ltd. v. Morris</u>	171
<u>Gross v. Wright</u>	176
<u>Wrotham Park v. Parkside Homes</u>	179
<u>Arbutus Park Estates Ltd. v. Fuller</u>	184
<u>Shepherd Homes Ltd. v. Sandham</u>	185
(iii) <u>Injunctions Relating to Trespass and Nuisance</u>	
(a) <u>Trespass</u>	
<u>Goodson v. Richardson</u>	189
<u>Woollerton and Wilson Ltd. v. Richard Constain Ltd.</u>	192
<u>Charrington v. Simons &amp; Co. Ltd.</u>	195
(b) <u>Nuisance</u>	
Ogus & Richardson, "Economics and the Environment: A Study of Private Nuisance"	197

<u>Shelfer v. City of London Electric Lighting Company</u>	204
<u>Canada Paper Co. v. A.J. Brown</u>	207
<u>K.V.P. Company Ltd. v. McKie</u>	212
<u>Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co. Inc.</u>	216
<u>Miller et al. v. Jackson et al.</u>	220
<u>Kennaway v. Thompson</u>	226
<u>Spur Industries, Inc. v. Del E. Webb Development</u>	230
 <u>Specific Performance</u>	
(i) <u>Introduction</u>	237
(ii) <u>Damages, Mitigation and Specific Performance</u>	238
<u>Asamera Oil Corp. Ltd. v. Sea Oil &amp; General Corp. et al;</u> <u>Band Corp., N.V. v. Brook</u>	238
<u>Red Deer College v. Michaels</u>	252
<u>Posner, Economic Analysis of Law</u>	255
<u>Radford v. De Froberville</u>	258
(iii) <u>Injunctions To Restrain Breach of Contract</u>	271
<u>Fothergill v. Rowland</u>	271
<u>Doherty v. Allman</u>	274
<u>Lumley v. Wagner</u>	277
<u>Donnell v. Bennett</u>	281
<u>Metropolitan Electric Supply Company Ltd. v. Ginder</u>	283
<u>Sky Petroleum v. V.I.P. Petroleum</u>	287
<u>Detroit Football Company v. Dublinski</u>	289
<u>Page One Records, Ltd. and Another v. Britton And Others (trading as "The Troggs") and Another</u>	298



(iv)	<u>Party Stipulation for Specific Relief</u>	301
(v)	<u>Contracts for the purchase and sale of chattels</u>	302
	<u>Dominion Iron &amp; Steel Co. v. Dominion Coal Co.</u>	302
	<u>Report on Sale of Goods (1979)</u>	306
(vi)	<u>Contracts for the Purchase and Sale of Land</u>	312
(vii)	<u>Contracts requiring continuing supervision</u>	315
	<u>Ryan v. Mutual Tontine Westminster Chambers Association</u>	315
	<u>Tanenbaum v. W.J. Bell Paper Co.</u>	317
	<u>C.H. Giles &amp; Co. v. Morris</u>	321
	<u>Hill v. C.A. Parsons &amp; Co. Ltd.</u>	322
	<u>The Problem of Supervision</u>	330
(viii)	<u>Part Performance and the Statute of Frauds</u>	353
	<u>Steadman v. Steadman</u>	335
	<u>Degleman v. Guaranty Trust Co.</u>	346
	<u>Carter v. Irving Oil Co. Ltd.</u>	348
	<u>Price v. Strange</u>	351
	<u>Ontario Law Reform Commission Report on Sale of Goods</u>	359
(ix)	<u>Equitable Damages</u>	361
	<u>Wroth v. Tyler</u>	361
	<u>Metropolitan Trust Co. of Canada v. Pressure Concrete Ltd.</u>	369
	<u>Johnson v. Agnew</u>	372
	<u>306793 Ontario Ltd. v. Rimes</u>	379
(x)	<u>Timing of the Action and Election of Remedies</u>	384
	<u>Kloepfer Wholesale Hardware and Automotive Ltd. v. Roy</u>	384
	<u>Macnaughton v. Stone</u>	386
	<u>Dobson v. Winton and Robbins Limited</u>	389

Declaration

(a)	<u>The Nature of Declaratory Relief</u>	395
	<u>Sara v. Sara</u>	395
	<u>Zamir, The Declaratory Judgment</u>	400
(b)	<u>When is Declaratory Relief Available?</u>	403
	<u>Guaranty Trust Company of New York v. Hannay &amp; Company</u>	403
	<u>Dyson v. Attorney-General</u>	411
	<u>Imperial Tobacco Ltd. v. A.G.</u>	415
	<u>Re Lockyer</u>	421
	<u>Re Carnarvon Harbour Acts.</u>	425
	<u>Llandudno Urban District Council v. Woods</u>	428

Receivers

(a)	<u>When a Receiver may be appointed</u>	
	<u>Kerr Receivers</u>	430
	<u>Owen v. Homan</u>	434
	<u>Morgan v. Hart</u>	437
	<u>Manning Wanless Building Supplies Ltd. v. Puskas and Flemke</u>	442
	<u>Garry Finance Corporation Limited v. Heizman and Smith</u>	444
	<u>Re Noriega and Noriega</u>	446
(b)	<u>The Role of the Receiver</u>	449
	<u>Parsons v. The Sovereign Bank of Canada</u>	480
(c)	<u>Receiver Appointed Out of Court</u>	453
	<u>Ostrander v. Niagara Helicopter Ltd. et al</u>	454

Self Help

(a)	<u>Abatement of Nuisance</u>	458
	<u>Perry v. Fitzhowe</u>	458
	<u>Lagan Navigation Co. v. Lambeg Bleaching, Dyeing and Finishing Company, Limited</u>	459
	<u>Lemmon v. Webb</u>	461
(b)	<u>Recovery of Chattels</u>	464
	<u>R. v. Doucette</u>	465

Replevin

<u>The Replevin Act</u>	470
Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court	471
Cannon, <u>The Replevin Action</u>	474

Account and Waiver of Tort 491

Street, <u>Principles of Law of Damages</u>	491
---	-----

<u>United Australia Ltd. v. Barclays Bank, Ltd.</u>	497
---	-----

<u>Phillips v. Homfray</u>	503
----------------------------	-----

<u>Maheasan v. Malaysia Housing Society</u>	507
---	-----

<u>Strand Electric and Engineering Co. Ltd. v. Brisford Entertainments Ltd.</u>	510
---	-----

<u>Peter Pan Manufacturing Corporation v. Corsets Silhouette, Ltd.</u>	512
--	-----

<u>Seager v. Copydex, Ltd.</u>	514
--------------------------------	-----

<u>Townsvlew Properties Ltd. et al v. Sun Construction &amp; Equipment Co. Ltd. et al</u>	515
---	-----



## Introduction

This course explores the middle ground between procedure, on the one hand, and substantive law, on the other. If we take procedure to refer to society's mechanisms for the resolution of disputes, ultimately the mechanics of litigation; and substantive law to be the definition of rights between individuals in their relations with each other and the state, then remedial law refers to the techniques available for the translation of substantive rights into concrete or practical terms.

The importance of this somewhat neglected area is obvious. Of what use are substantive rights if they are not or cannot be effectively implemented? How "fair" will the best possible procedural scheme appear to be if the litigant is left without effective redress at the end of the day?

Despite its importance, the law of remedies has received relatively little attention from academics. Moreover, as we shall see through the cases, it is not an area which has produced refined or systematic judicial thought.

One of the themes of the course is that remedial choices are more significant than the present literature would suggest, and more susceptible to analysis than is indicated by the case law. Not only are the choices significant, and thus deserving of thoughtful elaboration, but they are often agonizingly difficult. A great deal of judicial soul-searching is often hidden behind the concluding paragraph of the judgment which tells the plaintiff what it is he will actually get.

This state of relative unrefinement is both the curse and blessing of remedial law. It is a curse because litigants and judges are often unfairly at sea with respect to a very important aspect of the case. The converse is the blessing. The very want of definition in remedial law and the emphasis on judicial discretion allows the courts on occasion to make dramatic and significant shifts in the remedial area which often extend to have an impact on substantive rights.

Indeed, another theme which runs through the course is the use of remedial choice to repair substantive defects. Perhaps because remedial law is relatively less developed, the judges often find it easier to justify a desired result, difficult to justify on "black-letter" principles, by moulding novel remedial solutions than by departing from accepted substantive law doctrine. In this sense, remedial law takes on added (although perhaps illegitimate) significance.

Another recurrent theme is that of the impact of history. We will be focussing on the specific remedies of equity in this course. Are the historic principles governing equitable relief, the product of a now forgotten struggle between two courts vying for control within a single state, still to govern us. Maitland told us in the context of the common law that although dead, the forms of action still rule us from their graves. We shall see that to some extent, equity has its own ghosts of the past. We must ask, then, whether constraints historically imposed upon remedial choices remain valid today. We shall see that to some extent there is a revival of the true (pre-nineteenth century) spirit of equity in the case law, and that very often in the remedial context, the courts are more and more prepared to make significant and exciting strides.



Remedial choices may be roughly classified as being constitutive, substitutionary, or specific.

A constitutive remedy is one which itself declares a certain state of affairs or status. It requires no further implementation: the very fact of the judgment itself produces the desired remedy. The most obvious example is perhaps a divorce decree: the statement from the court that the parties are divorced is all that is needed, even at the practical level, to implement their change in status. As we shall see, except in specific areas, such as divorce, the constitutive or declaratory approach is not one with which the courts are at ease. The instinct produced by the common law tradition is to shrink from general statements or declarations of rights, and to opt for a more specific, concrete, and ad hoc response.

The presumptive remedy in our tradition is substitutionary: damages. We aim to put the injured or wronged party in the position he would have been insofar as money will allow. Time constrains us to spend little, if any, time on the basic issues in the law of damages. These matters tend to be fully explored in first year courses in Contracts and Torts. However, since damages is the presumptive remedy, we will constantly have to deal with the underlying policies and purposes of the law of damages although our focus will be on specific remedies. In this sense, our study of damages will tend to be in reverse; we will not be asking what is the appropriate measure of damages, but rather, whether is it possible and appropriate to translate in money terms, the substantive right the plaintiff legitimately asserts.

It is where damages fail to achieve this goal that specific relief is available. A specific remedy is one what gives the plaintiff the very thing he bargained for, restores property or rights to the state existing before the defendant's wrongful invasion, or protects the plaintiff's position from threatened harm. We will focus on the issues of specific relief for most of this course.